LTEL SIG Message from the Chair
Liz Hollingworth, University of Iowa

2015 Annual Convention
The 29th annual UCEA Convention will be held November 20-23, 2015 at the Manchester Grand Hyatt in San Diego, California. The convention theme “Re-Imagining the Frontiers of Education: Leadership With/In Transnational & Transcultural Spaces,” highlights this year’s location near the California-Mexico border and intends to draw attention to the border spaces that exist within our field, between both scholars and practitioners and among communities present in and around schools.

Mark your Calendars!
Saturday, November 21, 2015
7:15 pm
Manchester Grand Hyatt: Seaport DE

We have very exciting things planned for our annual UCEA convention. School leaders from the Sweetwater Union High School District in El Cajon, CA will be joining us on an expert panel to discuss the unique challenges they face as a border school. The panel discussion will be followed by a reception in their honor.

Continued…
You can see from the map below the distance between our hotel and the border between the US and Mexico.

Every morning, children walk from Tijuana, through the San Ysidro port of entry, board a trolley, then take a bus that takes them to school. These students, who migrate between two cultures, two languages, and two nations every day, are called “transfronterizos” (see the New York Times article from 2012 on the subject at http://tinyurl.com/transfronterizos).

We hope you will join us for this important and exciting conversation with practitioners about leadership in transnational and transcultural spaces.

-Liz Hollingworth, Chair LTEL-SIG
The responsibilities of building and district leaders have changed significantly since the late 1990s when the original Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards were developed and released. Federal policy initiatives like No Child Left Behind, the federal Race to the Top program, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) have refocused the work of educational leadership around student learning. States across the country have set higher expectations for student growth and achievement, placing new demands on district and school leaders to ensure all students are learning.

It is essential that national leadership standards set expectations for effective leadership for contemporary leadership practice. States, districts, schools and university and nonprofit leadership preparation programs currently use the standards to guide preparation, licensure, practice, support and evaluations for district and school leaders, including superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders.

What was considered effective in 1996, or even in 2008 when the standards were last reviewed, lags rather than leads current expectations. As a result, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA) have led a national standards revision process involving more than 70 principals, superintendents, state education departments’ staff, education professors, researchers, and other stakeholders.

By refreshing leadership standards, CCSSO and NPBEA will help to ensure that states, districts, schools, and leadership preparation entities have access to model leadership standards that identify the taproots and foundational aspects of leadership practice. Leadership standards play an integral role in informing and guiding the development, continuous improvement, and evaluation of all aspects of school leadership practice throughout the career continuum.

The first phase of the standards work involved the revision of the ISLLC policy standards, which serve as the backbone of most frameworks for understanding the role of educational leaders. This work should be completed this fall, and we hope to be able to share and discuss them during the UCEA Convention in San Diego.

Continued…
Standards for Leadership Preparation

The second phase of the standards work involves the revision the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards, known widely as the ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) standards. The preparation standards provide detailed guidance to leadership preparation programs on what is expected for the preparation of educational leaders. Although these standards were last revised in 2011, changes in ISSLC necessitate revision to the preparation standards to ensure alignment.

The standards guiding leadership preparation play a particularly important role within the leadership pipeline. Whereas the ISSLC standards reflect the leadership we would expect of leaders broadly, the preparation standards focus on the beginning stages of the leadership development continuum, identifying the knowledge and skills that can be developed through initial preparation.

Getting the NELP standards right is essential. Building and district leaders are expected to be ready to lead on day one, and that readiness is dependent upon the preparation they have received. Preparation programs need quality standards to guide the development and implementation of their programs and states and accrediting organizations need quality standards for the review and approval of such programs.

Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder participation and input is a major characteristic of the standards effort and ensures that the standards reflect both the best research on leadership practice and craft knowledge from practicing educational leaders at multiple levels of the enterprise. Two key stakeholder groups for the ELCC standards are the individuals who coordinate leadership preparation programs and individuals in state departments of education who oversee preparation programs. Preparation programs use the standards for guidance on program development, improvement, and evaluation. State Education Agencies use the standards to review, approve, accredit, evaluate and possibly close programs. Those preparation programs that are nationally accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE and TEAC) will use the ELCC standards for program accreditation.

To solicit input from these two important stakeholder groups, we developed two surveys focused on how the surveys were used, what concerns they had regarding the standards and how they were used, and what they hoped to see in the forthcoming version. Our intent was to better understand the perspectives and needs of both constituencies. In 2014, we administered the surveys to leadership preparation programs across the country and to all 50 state education agencies. As of the first of November, we had received responses from the program directors of 173 educational leadership preparation programs (66 were UCEA institutions), which together represent 33 states. Additionally, surveys were completed by 38 state education agencies. Below we share a selection of preliminary findings. UCEA will be releasing a more extensive report based on the results of these two surveys early in 2016.

Continued…
Of key significance, we found that the majority of respondents (both faculty and state officials) believed aligning preparation programs with national preparation standards was either very important (programs 52%; states 48%) or important (37%; states 45%). Most states (79%) intend to adopt or adapt the new version of the ISSLC and preparation standards, once they are released. Additionally, most programs, as noted in figure 1, found the process of aligning their programs to national leadership preparation standards to be very beneficial (50%) or beneficial (32%).

![Figure 1: Aligning Programs to Standards](image)

Additionally, the vast majority of programs undergo a standards-based national accreditation review process (85%) as well as a state review process (73%). According to preparation programs, the most important purpose of such reviews is the insight they provide for program improvement (72%), whereas state personnel considered program approval (100%) as the primary purpose of conducting program reviews. Table 1 provides additional insight into the differences in perspectives concerning the purpose of state and accreditation reviews.
Table 1: *Purpose of Program Reviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Programs Percentage</th>
<th>States Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program approval decisions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program renewal decisions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program redesign</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State program performance/comparison report</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of purpose, program reviews appear to be highly reliant on information and data submitted by programs and to a lesser degree on data collected centrally by the state (e.g., licensure examination scores). This is likely due to the limited amount of data that states share with programs. As indicated in Figure 2, other than licensure pass rates, states share very little centrally collected data with programs, and over 20% of states share no data with programs.

![Data Shared by States with Programs](image)

Figure 2: State Data Shared With Programs

Continued…
Nonetheless, programs collect and examine data from a variety of other sources, including surveys or interviews of graduates' employers (51%), aggregate scores from performance assessments (43%), compiled student performance data for schools led by graduates (16%), and complied teacher performance data for schools led by graduates (5%).

Program faculty use the above data as well as data drawn from candidate assessments for multiple purposes beyond accreditation, including program improvement and promoting the growth of individual candidates. Table 2 captures some of the strategies used to evaluate leadership candidates.

Table 2: Assessment Strategies Used to Evaluate Leadership Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio of their professional preparation</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work, projects, and accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty discussion of individual students’ progress</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a capstone or culminating project</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A final exam or assessment</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master thesis or research paper</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When states and programs were asked about the adequacy of resources available to them to engage in the program review process, about half of each group (43% of programs and 58% of states) felt they had adequate resources, and the other half (52% of programs and 42% of states) felt they needed additional resources. Among the resources identified as useful by more than 50% of programs were: preparation program evaluation materials (53%), model candidate assessments (54%), and collaboration with faculty from other programs (53%). For states the list included: review protocols (52%), training for reviewers (76%), and funds to compensate reviewers (69%).

Instead of each program or state developing these resources in isolation, it would be helpful for faculty affiliated with UCEA, the LTEL sig, Division A of AERA, NCPEA and other stakeholder groups to work collaboratively to design, develop and disseminate tools for preparation programs and states. The evaluation tools developed through the collaboration of LTEL and UCEA is a great example of what can be accomplished through such efforts. Close to 150 university preparation programs and NGOs have benefited from the INSPIRE Leadership program evaluation suite.

Continued…
Next Steps for the Preparation Standards

Together the new leadership practice and preparation standards will further clarify roles and responsibilities for educational leaders, guiding what they are expected to do in their daily work, as well as how they should be prepared and on what they will be evaluated. The standards will be rooted in both research and effective practice, highlighting the most important characteristics of education leaders operating within the current educational context.

Once the ISSLC standards revision process comes to a close, and new national educational leadership standards are adopted by NPBEA, the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards committee will commence its work to develop an aligned set of preparation standards. Michelle Young, UCEA/University of Virginia, has been tasked with chairing this effort and welcomes the input of colleagues. Feel free to email your thoughts or questions to mdyucea@virginia.edu.
The 2015 UCEA Convention at the Manchester Grand Hyatt in San Diego, California will play host to the **Fourth Annual UCEA Film Festival**. UCEA provided an opportunity for submissions of 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including our research and engaged scholarship, our preparation program designs and improvement efforts, our policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. Eight films were selected by a panel of reviewers for this year’s festival. They include:

#1 – Teacher Peer Excellence Group (Vanderbilt University)

#2 – Evolution of a Learning Revolution (East Carolina University)

#3 – Partnering with Universities (Prince George’s County, Maryland)

#4 – Leaders, Leadership and Danforth (University of Washington)

#5 – Digital Storytelling Retreat (North Carolina State University)

#6 – The Value of Danforth (University of Washington)

#7 – Dedicated Support (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C. Public Schools)

#8 – Santal School in India (University of Manitoba)

The 2015 UCEA Film Festival will host two sessions: a “Sip & Screen” on Friday, November 20, 2015 in the general session room from 8:30 PM until 9:30 PM, and a second showing on Saturday, November 21, from 3:20 PM until 4:10 PM.
Promotion News

Share your promotions, new jobs, graduations, and awards with the LTEL-SIG Newsletter committee to feature your accomplishments in our next newsletter!

We welcome submissions for the LTEL-SIG Kottkamp Dissertation of the Year Award!

The Robert Kottkamp Outstanding Dissertation Award recognizes a recent doctoral graduate as well as her or his dissertation advisor. The dissertation, successfully defended during the previous calendar year, may investigate educational leadership preparation and development programs, assess the impact of preparation on leadership practice, examine policy issues related to state or national leadership standards assessment and credentialing, or contribute through disciplined inquiry to the knowledge base about learning and teaching in educational leadership. The dissertation award also recognizes the contributions by former SIG Chair Robert Kottkamp (emeritus professor at Hofstra University) and co-founder of the UCEA/LTEL SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs. Please continue to check our website and your email for submission information.
State Policies for Principal Preparation Program Approval: Are they Research-Based?

Erin Anderson and Amy Reynolds
University of Virginia/UCEA

This November, UCEA will be releasing a new tool for policy makers and professors of educational leadership: The Policymakers Guide to Research-based Policy for Principal Preparation Program Approval and Licensure. The report, authored by UCEA Researchers Erin Anderson and Amy Reynolds, explores state legislative code, rules and regulations, and State Board of Education documents for the 50 states and the District of Columbia and provides detailed state profiles as well as state-to-state comparisons of 8 policy areas and 21 policy criteria that support the development of effective leaders.

Although tremendous attention has been dedicated to ranking and grading schools, districts, and other educational entities, state policies guiding the approval of leadership preparation programs and the licensure of educational leaders have received relatively limited attention. In response, this report is intended to provide a formative policy assessment tool. Research-based rubrics were developed and utilized to explore the current status of state policies for principal preparation program approval and candidate licensure. This research began with a panel of experts chosen by UCEA for their knowledge of effective practices for principal preparation and state policy. Through an iterative process, the team created a two-part rubric for principal preparation approval and principal licensure, and then applied the rubrics to state legislative code, rules and regulations, and State Board of Education documents.

Through this process, five high leverage policies, defined as policies that are supported in the research base and/or by practitioner experience as having improved the preparedness and effectiveness of practicing principals, were identified. These include one licensure policy area and four principal preparation program policies. The principal preparation policies include: (a) Selection; (b) Clinically Rich Internship; c) District Partnerships; and (d) Program Oversight, and the licensure policy area is: (e) Experience. In addition, one area of regulatory policy was identified as intending to help monitor principal preparation approval: (f) Program Standards and two were identified as regulating licensure: (g) Assessment and (h) Renewal. State policy allowing for alternative licensure pathways was also explored. Importantly, there is variation in the extent to which states have adopted policies in these areas, and, proportionately, more states have adopted policies for licensure despite greater empirical evidence for preparation program approval.

The report begins with the background for the inclusion of each of the policy areas, an example of policy that effectively meets the criteria within each of the high leverage policy areas, and an overview of the policy for of all 50 states and Washington D.C., noting which states met the criteria within each policy area. The next section provides individual state guides, including information on the degrees conferred in educational leadership, an overview of the state policies, the results for that state as compared to other states, and implications for high leverage policy engagement. In the final section, there are tables that present all of the states with the total number of criteria, both high leverage and regulatory.

SLPDN: School Leadership Preparation and Development Network Update
Karen Sanzo
Old Dominion University

Leadership development and preparation providers from throughout the United States convened in Chicago September 24-26, 2015 for the 5th Annual School Leadership Preparation and Development Network Conference. Across the course of the three-day event, participants engaged in dialogue and sharing activities focused around policy, research, and practice to better prepare school leaders. The conference was supported by the Illinois Partnerships Advancing Rigorous Training (IL-PART) project partners from the USDE School Leadership Program at the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University, the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago, the Cycles of Innovation and Continuous Improvement: A University/District Partnership to Produce Transformative Principals, the Urban Education Leadership Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Old Dominion University.

Day One featured the unveiling of a new Wallace Foundation commissioned report by Paul Manna (2015): Developing Excellent School Principals to Advance Teaching and Learning: Considerations for State Policy. Following Paul Manna’s presentation, a discussion panel (Michelle Young, Executive Director of UCEA; Amy McIntosh, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Delegated the Duties of the Assistant Secretary; Diane Rutledge Executive Director of the Large Unit District Association in Illinois; and Paul Manna, Professor at The College of William and Mary) explored the issues surfaced in the report and responded to questions and comments from the audience. A robust conversation around policy implications for collective leadership development practices for districts, external preparation providers, and Institute of Higher Education transpired and sparked many “next steps” for action. LSI members are encouraged to review the report on The Wallace Foundation website and discuss the implications for your own leadership development and preparation work with colleagues in your state.

Day Two and Three found participants “rolling up their sleeves” for an interactive and busy Working Conference. The Working Conference was named as such five years ago to recognize the high level of interaction at the event to provide multiple mechanisms to critically dissect preparation and development practice activities, collaboratively share and learn from one another around best and emerging development practices in the field, and engage in conversations about evaluating programs and research design. Presenters from across the country and various institutions from throughout the United States shared valuable development practices with focus areas such as: “Deploying “Experience in-a-Box” – Using Simulations to Enhance a Leadership Curriculum”, “Role of Technology in Leadership Development”, “Using Evaluation Findings to Inform Program Development in TNTP’s Camden PLUS Program”, “Rethinking Course Pedagogy and Projects: Developing Principals to Lead Cycles of Inquiry for School-Wide Improvement”, and “Examining Leadership Coaching for Principal Preparation and Development”.

LTEL members are invited to join the Network and share your best practices at our conference in 2016. Learn more at the SLPDN website: SLPDN.com.
Greetings Graduate Students! As we get ready to travel to San Diego for UCEA’s annual meeting, there is a lot to prepare for and reflect upon. UCEA’s Vision states “UCEA is a community of scholars committed to the improvement of leadership and policy that supports the learning and development of ALL children”. As developing researchers and scholars in the field of educational leadership, we are in an exciting position and have a responsibility to explore, communicate, and promote advancements in social justice within all of our emerging lines of research to coincide with the vision of UCEA.

From my position as a student member, I have come to interpret that our Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group is positioned to harness a social justice priority as this SIG focuses on the leadership development across the K-12 education system. We see in prior research the important role leadership plays in implementing policy (Hollingworth, 2012; Spillane & Callahan, 2000), establishing a positive and empowering culture and climate in education settings (Fullan, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2014), and influencing teacher practice as well as their levels of job satisfaction (Orphanos & Orr, 2014). Thus, as we build off of existing literature, should not a focus on social justice leadership be woven in to all aspects of our research topics and programing at our institutions of leadership preparation? Do we not find that bringing social justice into our leadership work communicates the urgency for ALL school leaders to serve ALL students like UCEA’s Vision implores?

The 2015 UCEA theme “Re-Imagining the Frontiers of Education: Leadership With/In Transnational & Transcultural Spaces,” draws attention to the fissures in the existing education milieu that need connecting. Through examination of policies, discussion of educational contexts, and reflection on the UCEA Vision, we can dedicate ourselves to bring the lens of social justice to our practice. There are many opportunities at UCEA’s annual meeting in November for students to engage in these important conversations. From our active involvement in the conference, we can then take our inspiration with us and to help advance the social justice vision set forth by our professional organization. Through the Graduate Student Summit, convention sessions, and the special sessions provided by the Graduate Student Council, UCEA students are offered opportunities to connect with other novice scholars working toward the same goals. Connections and collaborative work that evolves during our programs and participation in UCEA can help move us toward a more just society.

My experiences in graduate school have stressed that the concept of social justice is not a singular thread of research as something to be examined occasionally. Rather, it is the fabric from which the conversations about educational leadership is sewn and developed into action. UCEA has proven to be an organization focused on social justice leadership, and I am looking forward to learning more about this work when we all convene in November.

Continued…
There are some fantastic opportunities to meet, learn, and connect at the annual meeting. Below is a list of some of the UCEA events for graduate students as well as information about the LTEL SIG meeting:

◊ **Graduate Student Summit Orientation**  
(Thursday, November 19 1:00-2:00 pm; Coronado E1)

◊ **Graduate Student Summit**  
(Thursday, November 19 – Friday, November 20; various Hyatt conference rooms)

◊ **Graduate Students of Color Mentoring Session**  
(Friday, November 20 1:20-2:30 pm; Balboa C)

◊ **Jackson Scholars “RUN JSP” 5K**  
(Saturday, November 21 7:00-7:50 am; Boardwalk – Sally’s Seafood)

◊ **AERA Divisions A & L Graduate Student Breakfast: Publish and “Live”: Taking the Fear out of Publishing**  
(Saturday, November 21 8:00-9:10 am; Balboa C)

◊ **Overcoming the “Tyranny of the OR” in Post-PhD Career Planning: How to Remain Engaged in the Worlds of Research and Practice**  
(Saturday, November 21 10:40-11:50 am; Balboa C)

◊ **LTEL SIG Meeting**  
(Saturday, November 21 7:00-8:10 pm; Seaport DE)

◊ **Negotiating a Contract: A Guide for First Timers on the Academic Job Market**  
(Sunday, November 22 8:00-9:10 am; Balboa C)

◊ **“Shoulda, Coulda, Woulda…”: What We Wish We Had Known Before Becoming a Professor, The Remix**  
(Sunday, November 22 12:20-1:30 pm Balboa C)

◊ **Graduate Student Closing Session**  
(Sunday, November 22 3:10-4:00 pm; Balboa C)

Remember to find the LTEL SIG on Facebook by searching “Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership SIG” and connect with your UCEA and LTEL colleagues on Twitter!

See you in San Diego!
Katie Winn  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Educational Policy and Leadership Studies  
University of Iowa  
[Email](kathleen-winn@uiowa.edu)  
Twitter: @KatieMWinn

---
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2016 LTEL-SIG Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award in Research Nominations due January 31

The LTEL-SIG Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award in Research recognizes a distinguished record of excellence in research related to teaching and learning in Educational Leadership and Administration. Please continue to check our website for information. The award will be presented at the 2016 AERA Conference in Washington, DC.
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Visit the LTEL-SIG on Facebook to see photos of our members at the UCEA and AERA annual meetings: https://www.facebook.com/LTELsig